arXiv:1703.00082v1 [math.QA] 28 Feb 2017

MINIMAL MODELS OF QUANTUM HOMOTOPY LIE ALGEBRAS VIA THE BV-FORMALISM

CHRISTOPHER BRAUN AND JAMES MAUNDER

Abstract. Using the BV-formalism of mathematical physics an explicit construction for the minimal model of a quantum L_∞-algebra is given as a formal super integral. The approach taken herein to these formal integrals is axiomatic; they can be approached using perturbation theory to obtain combinatorial formulae as shown in the appendix. Additionally, there exists a canonical differential graded Lie algebra morphism mapping formal functions on homology to formal functions on the whole space. An L_∞-algebra morphism inverse to this differential graded Lie algebra morphism on the level of homology is constructed as a formal super integral.

Introduction

The Batalin-Vilkovisky (BV-)formalism was originally introduced in physics as a tool to quantise gauge theories and is named after the creators Igor Batalin and Grigori Vilkovisky [4, 5]. One of the strengths of the BV-formalism is it describes how to deal with certain super path integrals; understood as formal power series using perturbation theory. The BV-formalism has also found success in other fields, leading to many results including: deformation quantisation [9], an alternative description of the graph complex [25], an alternative proof of the Kontsevich theorem [48], and manifold invariants [10]. All told, the BV-formalism provides a framework in which odd symplectic geometry, homological algebra, and path integrals interact successfully. A modern formulation of the BV-formalism was given by Schwarz [51], but it should be noted that there are many papers where the BV-geometry is considered from its various standpoints, see [19, 30, 33, 52] for example. BV-algebras themselves have also been generalised to BV_∞-algebras; c.f. [6, 18, 34, 3].

The formal geometry of the BV-formalism is well suited to the study of (quantum) L_∞-algebras which can be studied in the same language. Accordingly, this viewpoint is taken herein to construct *minimal models* of quantum L_∞-algebras.

Quantum L_∞-algebras arose in work of Zwiebach [55] on closed string field theory. They have appeared in work of Markl [42] under the name 'loop homotopy algebras', and have appeared in work of the first author joint with Lazarev [7]. One particularly amenable viewpoint of a (quantum) L_∞-algebra structure on a vector space is a solution to the Maurer-Cartan equation in an appropriate differential graded Lie algebra. The Maurer-Cartan equation is known in physics—more specifically in quantum field theory—as the (quantum or classical) master equation and its use is central to this paper. Maurer-Cartan elements have many uses in mathematics besides defining L_∞-algebra structures: they govern deformation functors [8, 41, 44, 47, 50], in certain cases correspond to morphisms of certain commutative differential graded algebras, and model rational topological spaces [26, 37, 38, 45, 49]

It is known that minimal models exist for many sorts of homotopy algebras [31, 27]. To prove existence and uniqueness of minimal models is usually fairly straightforward. Indeed, in this paper, this is the content of Proposition 3.4, which we obtain as a consequence of standard facts concerning Maurer-Cartan moduli sets of differential graded Lie algebras. However, this argument is not at all constructive—one is often concerned not just with the existence of minimal models but also wishes to have explicit formulae to hand.

Explicit formulae for the structure maps of minimal models for A_∞-algebras were given in [32, 43, 46] as sums over trees. A more general approach was taken in [12] where an explicit formula for minimal models, in terms of sums over 'stable graphs', for an algebra over the cobar-construction of a differential graded modular operad was constructed.

We take a different approach to deducing formulae for minimal models in the present paper. Indeed, the formulae in terms of stable graphs are reminiscent of those given by perturbative expansions of path integrals using Feynman diagrams and this is the perspective we pursue here. We will show that the minimal model of a quantum L_∞-algebra can be given by a simple explicit integral formula coming from the BV-formalism (Theorem 4.2). These sorts of integrals have already been studied in the context of quantum field theory [15, 10]. The advantage of this approach is that we obtain a simpler and more conceptual proof of the minimal model formulae.

In fact, the combinatorial formulae in terms of stable graphs that one obtains using the results of [12] can be deduced from the integral formula given in this paper by standard methods of expansions of path integrals in terms of Feynman diagrams, which is given in Appendix A.

Recently, minimal models have found applications in theoretical physics. More specifically, minimal models have been found to have applications in string field theory and quiver gauge theory, [1, 2, 28, 39, 53].

The paper is organised as follows. Section 1 recalls results of linear formal symplectic geometry. In particular, the master equation (or Maurer-Cartan equation) and the notion of a strong deformation retract from one symplectic vector space to another are both recalled. Section 2 introduces the theory of integration used in this setting (Definition 2.1), provides a proof of an analogue of Stokes Theorem (Proposition 2.5), and discusses the relevant parts of the BV-formalism. Section 3 recalls details surrounding the theory of (quantum) L_∞-algebras and Proposition 2.8 introduces an important and useful filtration. The main result of the paper (Theorem 4.2) is contained within Section 4. That is, the explicit construction of the minimal model for a given quantum L_∞-algebra via a formal super integral. As a straightforward corollary of Theorem 4.2, a minimal model for a harmonic odd cyclic L_∞-algebra can be given via a formal super integral. Section 4 closes by providing an inverse L_∞-algebra morphism to the differential graded Lie algebra morphism embedding the functions on homology into the space of all functions; this is the content of Theorem 4.10. The combinatorial approach to formal super integration is briefly discussed in Appendix A. More precisely, within this appendix those formal super integrals considered throughout the paper are shown to admit a presentation as formal sums over so-called stable graphs: Theorems A.7 and A.8. To the knowledge of the authors, this formula as a sum over stable graphs cannot be found in the literature. It should be noted, however, that existing formulae are

very similar and we can just use the same, existing, methods to prove the formula in terms of stable graphs; Appendix A closely follows the argument of [16]. Indeed, the usual notion of a graph is a special case of a stable graph and by restricting our formula to usual graphs one can recover that of [16].

Notations and conventions

Fix the real numbers, $\mathbb{R}$, as the base field. For technical reasons, the base field is extended to the field of formal Laurent series $\mathbb{R}((\hbar))$ at some points of the paper. All unmarked tensors are assumed to be over the appropriate base field, unless otherwise stated. We will be concerned with the category of differential $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$-graded vector spaces ('super vector spaces'). The degree (or parity) of a homogeneous element v in a super vector space is denoted $|v|$. Following well established notation those elements of homogeneous degree 0 are referred to as even and those of homogeneous degree 1 are referred to as odd. The tensor product $V \otimes W$ of super vector spaces V and W has differential defined as: $d_{V\otimes W}(v\otimes w) = (d_V v)\otimes w + (-1)^{|v|} v \otimes (d_W w)$ and thus the category of super vector spaces is symmetric monoidal with symmetry isomorphism given by $s(v \otimes w) = (-1)^{|v||w|} w \otimes v$.

Denote by $\Pi\mathbb{R}$ the one dimensional super vector space (over $\mathbb{R}$) concentrated in odd degree. The functor given by taking a super vector space V to the tensor $V \otimes \Pi\mathbb{R}$ is denoted by ΠV (the *parity reversion* of V); likewise for vector spaces over $\mathbb{R}((\hbar))$. The space $\mathrm{Hom}(V, W)$ denotes the super vector space with even part the space of morphisms $V \to W$ (i.e. those linear maps preserving the grading) and odd part the space of morphisms $V \to \Pi W$ (i.e. those linear maps which reverse the grading). This can be equipped with a differential making it into an internal Hom functor, and hence the category of super vector spaces is a closed symmetric monoidal category. Note that some results contained within this paper also hold in the $\mathbb{Z}$-graded context once suitable adaptations are made.

For brevity the adjective 'super' is often be suppressed. In particular an associative, a commutative, or a Lie algebra is always the appropriate notion in the category of super vector spaces. The expressions 'differential (super)graded', 'commutative differential graded algebra' and 'differential graded Lie algebra' are abbreviated to 'dg', 'cdga' and 'dgla', respectively.

Given a dgla $\mathfrak{g}$ and a cdga A, recall the tensor product $\mathfrak{g} \otimes A$ possesses a well defined structure of a dgla: the bracket is given on elementary tensors by $[x\otimes a, y\otimes b] = [x, y] \otimes (-1)^{|a||y|} ab$.

The notion of a pseudo-compact (dg) vector space is used extensively within this text. A pseudo-compact vector space is one given by an inverse limit of finite-dimensional (dg) vector spaces. As such, a pseudo-compact vector space is equipped with a topology induced by the inverse limit, and thus all linear maps of pseudo-compact vector spaces are assumed to be continuous. The dual of a pseudo-compact (dg) vector space is, therefore, the topological dual. This has the luxury of always having $(V^*)^* \cong V$ without any finiteness conditions. Similarly, it will always be the case that $(V \otimes V)^* \cong V^* \otimes V^*$ since tensor products of pseudo-compact vector spaces $A = \varprojlim_i A_i$ and $B = \varprojlim_j B_j$ are always be assumed to mean completed tensor products, in other words $A \otimes B$ is the pseudo-compact vector space given by $\varprojlim_{i,j} A_i \otimes B_j$. Similarly, if V is a discrete vector space and $A = \varprojlim_i A_i$ is a pseudo-compact vector space, the tensor product $A \otimes V$ is always be assumed to mean $\varprojlim_i A_i \otimes V$. More details on pseudo-compact objects can be found in the

literature [17, 29, 54]. In particular, it should be noted that the functor $V \mapsto V^*$ gives a symmetric monoidal equivalence between the category of pseudo-compact (dg) vector spaces and the opposite category of (dg) vector spaces. Thus, for example, a pseudo-compact dg algebra is equivalently a dg coalgebra.

The completed symmetric algebra of a finite-dimensional vector space V is an example of a pseudo-compact cdga and it makes substantial appearances in this paper. The completed symmetric algebra is the pseudo-compact algebra $\hat{S}(V) := \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} S^i(V)$, that is as the direct product of symmetric tensor powers (over either $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{R}((\hbar))$) of the vector space V. The symmetric algebra $S(V)$ is a subalgebra of $\hat{S}(V)$.

We will often refer to a pronilpotent dgla (or cdga), meaning an inverse limit of nilpotent dglas (or cdgas). Nilpotent here will mean 'global' nilpotence: the descending central series stabilises at zero.

1. Formal symplectic geometry

A brief account of formal linear symplectic geometry is contained within this section. More specifically, a symplectic vector space is considered as a formal symplectic manifold. As such, some of the terminology used here reflects the geometric setting and many of the results stated in terms of vector spaces have known analogues and generalisations. For a general treatment of the BV-formalism see [51]. The adjective 'symplectic' means 'odd symplectic' unless otherwise stated. The notation V will generally be used to denote a vector space endowed with a symmetric bilinear form and W will generally be used to denote a symplectic vector space. As such, a first example of a symplectic vector space is ΠV, where the bilinear form on V is non-degenerate.

1.1. Preliminaries.

The algebra of functions on a symplectic vector space, W, is given by $\hat{S}W^*$. If W has a differential, say d, $\hat{S}W^*$ possesses both a canonical differential obtained from d (which herein is denoted, by an abuse of notation, also d) and an operator of order two corresponding to the symplectic form (the Laplacian, see Definition 1.3). Every symplectic vector space is of even dimension, and there exists a canonical basis $\{x_i^*, \xi_j^*\}_{i,j\in\{1,\dots,n\}}$ for W^* with x_i^* even and ξ_i^* odd such that the symplectic form is of canonical form: $\omega = \sum_i dx_i^* d\xi_i^*$.

Definition 1.1. *Given a symplectic vector space, a Lagrangian subspace is a maximal isotropic subspace, i.e. a subspace such that the restriction of symplectic form vanishes and is of maximal dimension with this property.*

Remark 1.2. A Lagrangian subspace must have dimension half that of the whole space, and any isotropic subspace extends to a Lagrangian one.

Lagrangian subspaces serve as convenient subspaces for integration; as shown in Section 2.1. Since this paper is only concerned with the finite-dimensional linear case, there exists the canonical measure μ on a given symplectic vector space (which restricts to a Lagrangian subspace). This measure is multiplied by a factor making the canonical measure a Gaussian measure, hence dealing with convergence issues. More details are contained in Definition 2.1 and the discussion following it. In the non-linear and infinite-dimensional cases things are no longer so straightforward.

Definition 1.3. *Let W be a symplectic vector space with basis $\{x_i^*, \xi_j^*\}_{i,j\in\{1,2,\dots,n\}}$ for W^* such that the symplectic form takes the canonical form. The Laplacian acts on formal functions by*

$$\Delta(g) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \partial_{x_i^*}\partial_{\xi_i^*} g.$$

Proposition 1.4. *The Laplacian defines a dg BV-algebra structure on $\hat{S}W^*$. Hence $\hat{S}W^*$ has the structure of an odd Poisson algebra with bracket given by*

$$[x, y] = (-1)^{|x|}\Delta(xy) - (-1)^{|x|}\Delta(x)y - x\Delta(y). \qquad \square$$

1.2. **Master equations.** To make sense of some constructions it is necessary to extend the base field from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}((\hbar))$ and extend vector spaces from W to $\overline{W} := W \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}((\hbar))$. The BV-algebra structure of $\hat{S}W^*$ is extended $\hbar, \hbar^{-1}$-linearly to $\hat{S}\overline{W}^*$—here the symmetric tensors are taken over $\mathbb{R}((\hbar))$.

Definition 1.5. *The exponential of a function is defined for all functions in some pronilpotent ideal and given by the formal power series:*

$$e^f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{f^n}{n!}.$$

Likewise, the logarithm of a function is defined for all functions f such that $(f-1)$ is in some pronilpotent ideal and is given by the formal power series:

$$\log(f) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{(f-1)^n}{n}.$$

Definition 1.6. *Let $m = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \hbar^i m_i \in \hat{S}\overline{W}^*$ be an even function with $m_i \in \hat{S}W^*$ for all $i \geq 0$ such that $\frac{m}{\hbar}$ belongs to a pronilpotent ideal of $\hat{S}\overline{W}^*$. The function m is said to satisfy the quantum master equation (QME) if $(d + \hbar\Delta)e^{\frac{m}{\hbar}} = 0$.*

A solution to the QME is equivalent to a solution to the Maurer-Cartan (MC) equation since

$$(d + \hbar\Delta)e^{\frac{m}{\hbar}} = \frac{1}{\hbar} e^{\frac{m}{\hbar}} \left((d + \hbar\Delta)m + \frac{1}{2}[m, m] \right).$$

The phrases 'solution to the QME' and 'MC element' will be used interchangeably. Writing out the MC equation in terms of the expansion $m_0 + \hbar m_1 + \hbar^2 m_2 + \dots$ leads to an equivalent system of equations collecting powers of $\hbar$. The first equation $d(m_0) + \frac{1}{2}[m_0, m_0] = 0$ is the classical master equation (CME) for the function m_0, and the second equation $d(m_1) + \Delta(m_0) + [m_0, m_1] = 0$ defines a so-called unimodular L_∞-algbera (see [7, 23]). In [7] the problem of lifting a solution to the CME to a solution of the QME is addressed and unimodularity plays a key role therein.

1.3. **Strong deformation retracts.** Given a strong deformation retract (SDR) from a vector space with a bilinear form onto some choice of representatives for homology, one arrives at a canonical choice of isotropic/Lagrangian subspace which is used heavily in Section 2.1. The notion of an SDR from a space onto its homology is equivalent to that of a Hodge decomposition, c.f. [12, 13]. Therefore, such an SDR always exists for a finite-dimensional vector space.

Definition 1.7. *Let V and U be two vector spaces, both equipped with symmetric bilinear forms. An SDR from V to U is a pair of even dg vector space morphisms $i\colon U \hookrightarrow V$ and $p\colon V \twoheadrightarrow U$ and an odd linear morphism $s\colon V \to V$ such that:*

- $pi = id_U$;
- $ds + sd = id_V - ip$;
- $si = 0$; $ps = 0$; $s^2 = 0$;
- $\langle ix, iy\rangle = \langle x, y\rangle$; $\ker(p) \perp \mathrm{im}(i)$; *and* $\langle sx, y\rangle = (-1)^{|x|}\langle x, sy\rangle$.

The conditions $si = 0$, $ps = 0$, and $s^2 = 0$ are the so-called side conditions and are not always included; the reason being is they can be imposed at no cost.

Proposition 1.8. *Let U, V be two vector spaces equipped with symmetric bilinear forms and (i, p, s) be morphisms satisfying all the conditions of an SDR bar the side conditions, then s can be replaced with a morphism s' in such a way that the triple (i, p, s') is an SDR.*

Proof. If s does not satisfy $si = 0$ and $ps = 0$, it can be replaced with $\tilde{s} = (ds + sd)s(ds + sd)$. The triple $(i, p, \tilde{s})$ now satisfies everything except $\tilde{s}^2 = 0$. Replacing $\tilde{s}$ with $s' = \tilde{s}d\tilde{s}$ means the triple (i, p, s') is an SDR. □

The properties of Definition 1.7 ensure that given an SDR of V onto $\mathrm{H}(V)$, one has a decomposition $V = \mathrm{im}(i) \oplus \mathrm{im}(s) \oplus \mathrm{im}(d)$. Furthermore, one has the orthogonality relations:

$$\mathrm{im}(i)^\perp = \mathrm{im}(s) \oplus \mathrm{im}(d), \quad \mathrm{im}(d)^\perp = \mathrm{im}(i) \oplus \mathrm{im}(s), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{im}(s)^\perp = \mathrm{im}(i) \oplus \mathrm{im}(d).$$

Let the bilinear form on V be non-degenerate. The decomposition $V = \mathrm{H}(V) \oplus \mathrm{im}(s) \oplus \mathrm{im}(d)$ gives rise to a decomposition of the symplectic vector space $W = \Pi V$ as $W = \Pi\,\mathrm{H}(V) \oplus \Pi\,\mathrm{im}(s) \oplus \Pi\,\mathrm{im}(d)$. Therefore, define the subspace $\mathcal{L}_s = \Pi\,\mathrm{im}(s)$ and notice it is a Lagrangian subspace of $\Pi\,\mathrm{im}(i)^\perp$.

Proposition 1.9. *If $\mathcal{L}_s$ is non-zero, then the dimension of the odd subspace is even.*

Proof. One can define an odd symmetric non-degenerate form $(x, y) = \langle x, dy\rangle$ on $\mathcal{L}_s$. Therefore, the form is skew symmetric when restricted to odd coordinates and—by forgetting the grading—the form defines a symplectic form on the vector space of odd coordinates, hence there must be an even number of odd coordinates. □

2. The BV formalism

Here the necessary facts concerning the BV-formalism are recalled. For a more in depth exploration of the BV-formalism and BV-geometry see one of the many resources [4, 5, 15, 30, 48, 51, 52].

2.1. **Integration and BV Stokes' Theorem.** The integration over Lagrangian subspaces defined in this section provides an important tool for Section 4. These integrals are defined as normalised super integrals; alternatively they could be evaluated using perturbation theory, c.f. Appendix A.

Let W be an exact symplectic vector space such that $W = L_1 \oplus L_2$, where L_1 and L_2 are Lagrangian subspaces of W and $d\colon L_1 \to L_2$ is an isomorphism. Given some even element $x \in L_1$, a suitable choice of coordinates $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ on the even part of L_1 diagonalises the quadratic function $x \mapsto \langle x, dx\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{j} x_i^2 - \sum_{i=j+1}^{k} x_i^2$. Let $\epsilon(x_i) = 1$ if x_i belongs to the first sum and $\epsilon(x_i) = -1$ if x_i belongs to the second

sum. Similarly, there exists coordinates $\{\xi_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_n\}$ on the odd part of L_1 such that the quadratic function $\xi \mapsto \langle \xi, d\xi \rangle = -(\xi_{k+1}\xi_{k+2} + \xi_{k+3}\xi_{k+4} + \cdots + \xi_{n-1}\xi_n)$, since L_1 has an even number of odd coordinates (c.f. Proposition 1.9). For $i \in \{1, 3, 5, \dots, n-1\}$, the coordinates ξ_i and ξ_{i+1} will be said to be a pairing of odd coordinates.

Definition 2.1. *For even $x_i \in L_1$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}\langle x_i, dx_i\rangle} \mu_{x_i} = 1,$$

and, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the recursive relation

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} x_i^{2(n+1)} e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}\langle x_i, dx_i\rangle} \mu_{x_i} = \epsilon(x_i)(2n+1)\hbar \int_{\mathbb{R}} {x_i}^{2n} e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}\langle x_i, dx_i\rangle} \mu_{x_i}$$

will be called integration by parts (for even coordinates). For a pairing of odd coordinates, ξ_i and ξ_{i+1},

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{\frac{1}{2\hbar}\xi_i\xi_{i+1}} \mu_{\xi_i}\mu_{\xi_{i+1}} := 1, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \xi_i e^{\frac{1}{2\hbar}\xi_i\xi_{i+1}} \mu_{\xi_i}\mu_{\xi_{i+1}} := 0,$$
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \xi_{i+1} e^{\frac{1}{2\hbar}\xi_i\xi_{i+1}} \mu_{\xi_i}\mu_{\xi_{i+1}} := 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \xi_i\xi_{i+1} e^{\frac{1}{2\hbar}\xi_i\xi_{i+1}} \mu_{\xi_i}\mu_{\xi_{i+1}} := \hbar.$$

The integral is extended in the obvious manner to integrals of polynomial functions in $S\overline{W}^*$ over L_1 by extending $\hbar, \hbar^{-1}$-linearly and by setting

$$\int_{L_1} f e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(f e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}}\big|_{L_1} \right) \mu_{x_1} \dots \mu_{x_k} \mu_{\xi_{k+1}} \dots \mu_{\xi_n},$$

where σ is the quadratic function corresponding to $? \mapsto \langle ?, d? \rangle$. This integral is a Laurent polynomial in $\mathbb{R}[\hbar, \hbar^{-1}]$, because the integrand is restricted to L_1 and the integral is taken over all the coordinates of L_1.

Remark 2.2. In Definition 2.1 integration by parts is defined for even coordinates. There is no integration by parts defined for odd coordinates, because odd coordinates square to zero.

At first glance, Definition 2.1 seems a little unnatural and could depend on the choice of coordinates. This is not the case, as the following argument explains.

For even x and some function f one wants to evaluate the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} f(x) e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}\langle x, dx\rangle} \mu_x.$$

A change of variables implies $\langle x, dx \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{l} x_i^2 - \sum_{i=l+1}^{k} x_i^2$. If $l = k$, there is no issue and the integral converges normally. If $l < k$, one first needs to introduce the function

$$g_f(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}(\sum_{i=1}^{l} x_i^2 + \sum_{i=l+1}^{k} (tx_i)^2)} \mu_x,$$

defined for all non-zero real numbers. Expanding $g_f(t)$ as a formal power series, one can use analytic continuation to define g_f for all non-zero complex numbers. The original integral is, therefore, equal to $g_f(i)$; for example $\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\frac{1}{2\hbar}x^2} \mu_x = -i\sqrt{2\hbar\pi}$. Note these integrals only exist formally.

To see how this relates to Definition 2.1, one can integrate $g_{x_i^{2n}}(t)$ by parts to establish the recursive relation:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} x_i^{2(n+1)} e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}\langle x_i, dx_i\rangle}\mu_{x_i} = \frac{(2n+1)\hbar}{t^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} {x_i}^{2n} e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}\langle x_i, dx_i\rangle}\mu_{x_i}.$$

The integrals in Definition 2.1 have also been normalised, that is they have been divided by $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}\langle x, dx\rangle}\mu_x$. This normalisation causes the integrals appearing in Definition 2.1 to be the ratio of two integrals and, thus, they do not depend upon the choice of linear coordinates.

Remark 2.3. The above argument is known to physicists as the Wick rotation. The non-degeneracy of $\langle x, dx\rangle$ on L_1 means the integration is against a Gaussian measure, dealing with convergence issues for even variables, although these integrals need only exist formally; see [25].

For odd ξ, the standard definition for odd integration is $\int_{\mathbb{R}} 1\mu_\xi = 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \xi\mu_\xi = 1$. This has been used in Definition 2.1, along with dividing by $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}\langle \xi, d\xi\rangle}\mu_\xi$, meaning the integrals do not depend upon the choice of coordinates, as they are given by the ratio of two integrals.

An analogue of Stokes' Theorem is now recalled after a couple of auxiliary results. The more general original result is found in [51]. For an alternative proof using the usual exterior calculus in the linear case see [25].

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{L} \subset W$ be a Lagrangian subspace such that $\sigma(y) = \langle y, dy\rangle$ is non-degenerate. For x_i even*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_{x_i}(x_i^m e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}\sigma(x_i)})\mu_{x_i} = 0.$$

For ξ_i and ξ_{i+1} an odd pairing and $f \in SW^*$ any polynomial, for $j \in \{i, i+1\}$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \partial_{\xi_j}(f e^{\frac{1}{2\hbar}\xi_i\xi_{i+1}})\mu_{\xi_i}\mu_{\xi_{i+1}} = 0.$$

Proof. In the even case, compute the partial derivative and when m is odd integrate by parts. The odd case is immediate from the calculation. □

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{L} \subset W$ be a Lagrangian subspace such that $\sigma(y) = \langle y, dy\rangle$ is non-degenerate and let $f \in SW^*$ be any polynomial, then*

$$\int_{\mathcal{L}} \Delta\left(f e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}}\right) = 0.$$

Proof. It follows from computation and Proposition 2.4. □

2.2. **Integrating solutions to the QME.** Section 2.1 assumes $\mathrm{H}(W) = 0$, leading to the existence of a Lagrangian subspace on which $\langle x, dx\rangle$ is non-degenerate, see Remark 2.3. In general, the symplectic vector space in question may have non-trivial homology and thus we must now consider this more general case. Recall the decomposition given in Section 1.3. Clearly, $\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{im}(i)^\perp) = 0$, so the preceding results can be applied to $\mathrm{im}(i)^\perp$.

Definition 2.6. *Given a symplectic vector space $W = H(W) \oplus \mathrm{im}(i)^\perp$, the integral of a polynomial $f \in S\overline{W}^*$ over $\mathcal{L}_s$ is given by $(id_{H(W)} \otimes \int_{\mathcal{L}_s})(f) \in S(\overline{H(W)}^*)$.*

So far integration has been defined for arbitrary polynomials $f \in S\overline{W}^*$. It will be necessary to integrate certain infinite series in $\hat{S}\overline{W}^*$, however this raises the issue of convergence. For instance, the integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^{2k}}{\hbar^k}\right) e^{\frac{-1}{2\hbar}x^2}\mu_x$ does not converge. It will be necessary to be able to integrate exponentials of the form $e^{\frac{f}{\hbar}}$ where f is a formal power series belonging to a certain subspace of $\hat{S}W^*[|\hbar|]$. It turns out that integrals converge when integrating functions of this exponential form, as is now explained.

Definition 2.7. *Introduce the weight grading on the cdga $\hat{S}W^*[|\hbar|]$ by requiring that for a monomial $f \in \hat{S}W^*$ of degree n, the element $f\hbar^g$ has weight $2g+n$. Let $\mathfrak{h}[W]$ be the subspace of $\hat{S}W^*[|\hbar|]$ containing those elements of weight grading > 2.*

Proposition 2.8. *For all $i \geq 1$ let F_i be the subspace of $\mathfrak{h}[W]$ given by all vectors of weight grading $\geq i-2$. The filtration $\{F_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ is Hausdorff and complete.* □

It is clear the cdga $\mathfrak{h}[W]$ inherits the structure of an odd Poisson algebra from $\hat{S}W^*[|\hbar|]$. Further, it is clear that $\mathfrak{h}[W]$ is pronilpotent, whereas $\hat{S}W^*[|\hbar|]$ is not.

The following is an elementary observation:

Proposition 2.9. *Integration over an even coordinate or a pairing of odd coordinates fixes the weight grading.* □

Proposition 2.10. *For $f \in \mathfrak{h}[W]$, the formal Laurent series f' given by*

$$f' = \hbar \log\left(\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{f}{\hbar}} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}}\right)$$

converges and consists of non-negative powers of $\hbar$ only, i.e. it is a formal power series in $\hbar$. Moreover, $f' \in \mathfrak{h}[\mathrm{H}(W)]$.

Proof. The first statement follows immediately from Appendix A and, in particular, Theorem A.8. The second statement now follows from the first and Proposition 2.9. □

Lemma 2.11. *Let $m \in \mathfrak{h}[W]$ be a solution to the QME, then $m' \in \mathfrak{h}[\mathrm{H}(W)]$ given by*

$$m' = \hbar \log\left(\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{m}{\hbar}} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}}\right)$$

satisfies the QME. □

The proof is suppressed here as it is a corollary of Proposition 2.17 given later. Lemma 2.11 is well known in various guises; see [10, 15, 35]. In fact, in loc. cit. the lemma includes an additional statement: if the Lagrangian subspace $\mathcal{L}_s$ is perturbed by a small amount a homotopic solution to the QME is achieved. This latter statement is a corollary of Theorem 4.2.

2.3. **Homotopy of solutions to the QME.** The notion of a homotopy between MC elements in a fixed dgla is standard and is equivalent to gauge equivalence for pronilpotent dglas; see [7, 50]. Since the dglas considered within this paper are pronilpotent, this section will make the assumption that all dglas are pronilpotent. Given a dgla $\mathfrak{g}$, let $\mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{g})$ denote the solutions to the MC equation in $\mathfrak{g}$.

Definition 2.12.

- *Let $\mathbb{R}[t, dt]$ be the free cdga over $\mathbb{R}$ with generators t and dt (even and odd respectively) subject to the condition $d(t) = dt$. Clearly there exists two evaluation maps $|_0, |_1 \colon \mathbb{R}[t, dt] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by setting t to 0 and 1, respectively.*
- *For some dgla $\mathfrak{g}$, let $\mathfrak{g}[t, dt]$ be the dgla given by $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathbb{R}[t, dt]$. Clearly there exists two evaluation maps $|_0, |_1 \colon \mathfrak{g}[t, dt] \to \mathfrak{g}$ defined by setting t to 0 and 1, respectively.*

Definition 2.13. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a dgla. $\xi, \eta \in \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{g})$ are said to be homotopic if there exists $H(t) \in \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{g}[t, dt])$ such that $H(0) = \xi$ and $H(1) = \eta$.*

Definition 2.14. *The Maurer-Cartan moduli set, denoted $\mathcal{MC}(\mathfrak{g})$, is the set of equivalence classes of $\mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{g})$ under the homotopy relation.*

For a symplectic vector space W, consider a homotopy $H(t) \in \mathfrak{h}[W][t, dt]$. Clearly, $H(t) = A(t) + B(t)dt$. Further, there exists the equivalent exponential form

$$e^{\frac{H(t)}{\hbar}} = e^{\frac{A(t)}{\hbar}} + \frac{1}{\hbar} e^{\frac{A(t)}{\hbar}} B(t)dt.$$

We can extend Definition 2.1 A-linearly:

Definition 2.15. *Let A be a cdga. Given an element $\sum_i f_i \otimes a_i \in SW^* \otimes A$, let*

$$\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} \left(\sum_i f_i \otimes a_i \right) e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} := \sum_i \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} f_i e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} \right) \otimes a_i.$$

Proposition 2.16. *If $W = \mathrm{im}(i) \oplus \mathrm{im}(i)^\perp$ is an orthogonal decomposition, then the Laplacian splits $\Delta = \Delta_{\mathrm{im}(i)} + \Delta_{\mathrm{im}(i)^\perp}$. Moreover, given an element $\sum_i f_i \otimes a_i \in SW^* \otimes A$,*

$$\Delta_{\mathrm{im}(i)} \int_{\mathcal{L}_s} \left(\sum_i f_i \otimes a_i \right) e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} = \int_{\mathcal{L}_s} \Delta \left(\sum_i f_i \otimes a_i \right) e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}}$$

Proof. The first statement is immediate. The second statement follows from three facts: the observation $\Delta_{\mathrm{im}(i)}$ commutes with integration and restriction (because it is composed of partial derivatives on $\mathrm{im}(i)$), the first statement, and Proposition 2.5. □

Proposition 2.17. *Let $\sum_i f_i \otimes a_i \in \mathfrak{h}[W] \otimes A$ be a solution to the QME. The function*

$$\hbar \log \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{1}{\hbar} \sum_i f_i \otimes a_i} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} \right)$$

is a solution to the QME in $\mathfrak{h}[\mathrm{H}(W)] \otimes A$.

Proof. The statement follows readily from Proposition 2.10 and 2.16, noticing that the latter continues to hold in the limit. □

As a simple corollary of this proposition it can be seen that integrating a homotopy of MC elements in $\mathfrak{h}[W]$ leads to a homotopy of MC elements in $\mathfrak{h}[\mathrm{H}(W)]$, by setting $A = \mathbb{R}[t, dt]$.

Proposition 2.18. *Given a homotopy $H(t)$ of $\eta, \nu \in \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[W])$, $H'(t)$ given by*

$$H'(t) = \hbar \log \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{H(t)}{\hbar}} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} \right)$$

defines a homotopy of $\eta', \nu' \in \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\mathrm{H}(W)])$. □

In fact, given a specific form of $H(t)$, a specific form of $H'(t)$ can be given.

Proposition 2.19. *Given a homotopy* $H(t) = A(t) + B(t)dt$ *of* $\eta, \nu \in \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[W])$, *the induced homotopy* $H'(t) = A'(t) + B'(t)dt$ *of* $\eta', \nu' \in \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\mathrm{H}(W)])$ *is given by*

$$A'(t) = \hbar \log \int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{A(t)}{\hbar}} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} \quad \textit{and} \quad B'(t) = e^{\frac{-A'(t)}{\hbar}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{A(t)}{\hbar}} B(t) e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} \right).$$

Proof. A quick check proves the formulae are correct. □

3. Prerequisites on homotopy Lie algebras

This section recalls those facts concerning (quantum) L_∞-algebras seen as relevant in the context of this paper; fixing both terminology and notation.

3.1. **Quantum homotopy Lie algebras.** Similar to L_∞-algebra structures, a quantum L_∞-algebra structure is given by a MC element in a dgla.

Definition 3.1. *Let* V *be a vector space equipped with an odd non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form. A quantum* L_∞*-algebra structure on* V *is an even element* $m(\hbar) = m_0 + \hbar m_1 + \hbar^2 m_2 + \cdots \in \mathfrak{h}[\Pi V]$ *that satisfies the QME. The pair* (V, m) *is referred to as a quantum* L_∞*-algebra.*

Remark 3.2. The restriction on the weight grading in Definition 2.7 used to construct $\mathfrak{h}[\Pi V]$ is a symptom of the so-called stability condition for modular operads, c.f. [20]. Thus one can define quantum L_∞-algebras as algebras over the Feynman transform of the modular closure of the cyclic operad governing commutative algebras. This view is not used here.

Remark 3.3. The definition of an L_∞-algebra can be recovered from the definition of a quantum L_∞-algebra; the canonical derivation associated to m_0 defines an odd cyclic L_∞-algebra on V (see [40]), so forgetting the cyclic structure one obtains an L_∞-algebra. For greater details regarding L_∞-algebras one should consult the various literature: [7, 12, 24, 36]. Further, the derivation associated with m_0 paired with the function m_1 defines a unimodular L_∞-algebra structure on V; see [7, 23] for details.

3.2. **Minimal models of quantum homotopy Lie algebras.** Let (V, m) be a quantum L_∞-algebra. Recall there exists two linear dg vector space morphisms $i\colon \mathrm{H}(V) \to V$ and $p\colon V \to \mathrm{H}(V)$ compatible with the symplectic forms, coming from an SDR (see Section 1.3).

Proposition 3.4. *Given an SDR from* V *to* $\mathrm{H}(V)$, *the dgla morphism*

$$\iota\colon \mathfrak{h}[\Pi\,\mathrm{H}(V)] \to \mathfrak{h}[\Pi V]$$

defined by $f \mapsto ifp$ *is a filtered quasi-isomorphism and hence induces a bijection between the MC moduli sets, i.e. the homotopy classes of quantum* L_∞*-algebra structures on* $\mathfrak{h}[\Pi\,\mathrm{H}(V)]$ *and* $\mathfrak{h}[\Pi V]$ *are in bijective correspondence.*

Proof. Take the filtrations by weight grading, c.f. Proposition 2.8, then clearly one has quasi-isomorphisms $\frac{F_i\mathfrak{h}[\Pi\,\mathrm{H}(V)]}{F_{i+1}\mathfrak{h}[\Pi\,\mathrm{H}(V)]} \to \frac{F_i\mathfrak{h}[\Pi V]}{F_{i+1}\mathfrak{h}[\Pi V]}$. The fact that filtered quasi-isomorphisms induce isomorphisms of MC moduli sets is well-known (see [8, 21], or the Koszul duality of [38, 45]). □

Remark 3.5. The finer notion of a filtered quasi-isomorphism is required here in order to induce an isomorphism of MC moduli sets. Two dglas which are just quasi-isomorphic may not have isomorphic MC moduli sets as show in the example below.

Example 3.6. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \left\{a, [a,a] : |a| = -1, da = \frac{-1}{2}[a,a]\right\}$ be a dgla. Clearly $\mathfrak{g}$ is acyclic and quasi-isomorphic to the zero dgla, but $\mathcal{MC}(\mathfrak{g}) = \{0, a\} \neq \mathcal{MC}(0)$.

Definition 3.7. *Given a quantum L_∞-algebra (V, m), the minimal model of (V, m) is a quantum L_∞-algebra $(\mathrm{H}(V), m')$ such that $\iota(m')$ is homotopic to m (as an MC element in $\mathfrak{h}[\Pi V]$).*

Remark 3.8. The usual definition of a minimal model for, say, an L_∞-algebra V is that of an L_∞-algebra on the homology $\mathrm{H}(V)$ which is L_∞quasi-isomorphic to V. In the case of quantum L_∞-algebras this definition does not work due to the presence of the non-degenerate bilinear form: there is no longer an especially good notion of a quantum L_∞-map which is not an isomorphism. Therefore, given a quantum L_∞-algebra on the homology $\mathrm{H}(V)$, we need to say in what sense it is equivalent to the original quantum L_∞-algebra on V. In the definition above this is done by extending by zero the quantum L_∞-algebra on $\mathrm{H}(V)$ to all of V and requiring it to be homotopic (as a Maurer-Cartan element) to the original quantum L_∞-algebra.

It should be noted that if we took this definition in the context of usual L_∞-algebras it would be equivalent to the usual definition.

Proposition 3.4 shows the existence and uniqueness up to homotopy of minimal models for quantum L_∞-algebras. However, this does not give an explicit construction or formula for the minimal model. This will be addressed in the next section.

4. Integral formulae for minimal models

This section contains the main result of the paper (Theorem 4.2): the quantum L_∞-algebra $(\mathrm{H}(V), m')$ given by the integral formula in Lemma 2.11 is proven to provide the minimal model for the original quantum L_∞-structure on (V, m).

4.1. **The construction of the minimal model.** Recall from Section 2.1 it is possible to integrate a solution to the QME to obtain a solution to the QME on homology.

Viewing integration as a morphism of sets $\rho\colon \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\Pi V]) \to \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\Pi\,\mathrm{H}(V)])$ it is a one-sided inverse to $\iota\colon \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\Pi\,\mathrm{H}(V)]) \to \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\Pi V])$, where the restriction of ι is denoted the same by an abuse of notation.

Proposition 4.1. *The morphism ρ is a left inverse of ι. The morphism ρ descends to the level of MC moduli spaces, and therefore induces the inverse bijection on the level of Maurer-Cartan moduli sets.*

Proof. It is an easy check to see that $\rho \circ \iota = id_{\mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\Pi\,\mathrm{H}(V)])}$. To prove the second statement, one recalls Proposition 2.18. □

Theorem 4.2. *Given a quantum L_∞-structure (V, m), the integral formula*

$$m' = \rho(m) = \hbar \log \int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{m}{\hbar}} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}}$$

defines a quantum L_∞-algebra $(\mathrm{H}(V), m')$ and, moreover, it is the minimal model of (V, m).

Proof. The first statement is a rephrasing of Lemma 2.11. Next, one simply applies the preceding result to see that $\iota(m')$ is homotopic to m. □

Remark 4.3. Using the results of Appendix A, we can now deduce as a corollary of 4.2 the known combinatorial formulae for the minimal model in terms of stable graphs given in [12].

Ordinarily, when attempting to lift a solution to the classical master equation to a solution to the quantum master equation, one is met by a series of obstructions; one would require vanishing cohomology classes in $\hat{S}\Pi V^*$. However, if in the first obstruction one asks for it to hold on the nose rather than up to cohomology class, then all higher obstructions vanish. All told, the following holds [7].

Proposition 4.4. *Let (V, ξ) be an odd cyclic L_∞-algebra and let m denote the Hamiltonian associated to ξ. If m is harmonic ($\Delta(m) = 0$), then (V, m) is a quantum L_∞-algebra lifting ξ.*

Proof. It is easy to see that since m is harmonic, all obstructions vanish. □

Therefore, having a quantum lift allows one to apply Theorem 4.2; resulting in the following.

Corollary 4.5. *Let (V, ξ) be an odd cyclic L_∞-algebra and let m denote the Hamiltonian associated to ξ. If m is harmonic, then the minimal model of (V, ξ) is given by $(\mathrm{H}(V), X_{\rho(m)})$, where X_f denotes the derivation associated to a Hamiltonian f.* □

4.2. **An inverse morphism on homology.** The morphism ι is a (filtered) quasi-isomorphism of dglas, and as such there exists an L_∞-algebra morphism inverse to ι on the level of homology. To construct this morphism a preliminary result is recalled.

Definition 4.6. *Let V and W be two dglas. An L_∞-morphism $f\colon V \to W$ is a cdga morphism $\hat{S}\Pi V^* \to \hat{S}\Pi W^*$.*

MC elements of dglas play a significant role in the theory of L_∞-algebras: as well as being used to define L_∞-algebra structures, they also correspond to morphisms of pseudo-compact cdgas as shown in the following well known result (which can be extended to include L_∞-algebras, c.f. [6] for example).

Proposition 4.7. *Let V be a dgla and A be a unital pseudo-compact cdga. The functor given by taking $A \mapsto \mathrm{MC}(V \otimes A)$ is represented by $\hat{S}\Pi V^*$.* □

Remark 4.8. An L_∞-morphism of dglas $V \to W$ gives rise, for any unital pseudo-compact cdga A, to a map of sets $\mathrm{MC}(V \otimes A) \to \mathrm{MC}(W \otimes A)$ functorial in A, i.e. a natural transformation. Moreover, any such natural transformation is, by Yoneda's Lemma, equivalent to having an L_∞-morphism $(V, m_V) \to (W, m_W)$. For greater details see [14].

Therefore, if the morphism ρ can be extended to include dg coefficients in a functorial manner, this is equivalent to the required L_∞-algebra morphism.

Definition 4.9. *Let A be a pseudo-compact cdga. The morphism of sets*

$$\tilde{\rho}\colon \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\Pi V], A) \to \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\Pi \,\mathrm{H}(V)], A)$$

is given by mapping $\sum_{i\in I} f_i \otimes a_i$ to the function given by

$$\hbar \log \int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{1}{\hbar}\sum_{i\in I} f_i \otimes a_i} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}}.$$

The morphism $\tilde{\rho}$ is clearly functorial in both arguments, and by Proposition 2.17 it is well-defined. Further, $\tilde{\rho}$ is a one-sided inverse to ι on the level of MC sets. Let $\tilde{\iota}\colon \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\Pi \,\mathrm{H}(V)], A) \to \mathrm{MC}(\mathfrak{h}[\Pi V], A)$ be the A-linear morphism corresponding to ι, defined in the obvious way.

Theorem 4.10. *$\tilde{\rho}$ is a left inverse of $\tilde{\iota}$. The morphism $\tilde{\rho}$ provides the L_∞-morphism inverse ι on the level of homology.*

Proof. The first statement is straightforward. Using Yoneda's Lemma, as explained in Remark 4.8, one arrives at the proof of the second statement. □

Appendix A. Integrals as sums over graphs

Formal integrals like those used throughout the paper are commonly treated using the formalism of Feynman Diagrams. More precisely, these integrals can often be written as formal series with sums taken over certain graphs. Within this appendix, a presentation as a formal series summing over so-called stable graphs will be given for the integrals considered in this paper. To the knowledge of the authors, such a presentation in terms of stable graphs is not available elsewhere in the literature; although only a mild generalisation of what is available, e.g. [16], is required. It should be noted, however, that the obtained formulae are precisely those given in the setting of minimal models for algebras over modular operads in [12]. To give the combinatorial presentation, a brief discourse to introduce the relevant material is necessary.

A.1. Stable graphs.

Stable graphs were introduced by Ginzburg and Kapranov [22] in the context of modular operads and later used in giving formulae for minimal models by Chuang and Lazarev [12, 11]. Here only the briefest of details will be recalled and for more details one should consult those papers cited.

Definition A.1. *A graph G is given by the following data:*

- *A finite set of half edges,* $\mathrm{Half}(G)$*, and a finite set of vertices,* $\mathrm{Vert}(G)$*, with a morphism $f\colon \mathrm{Half}(G) \to \mathrm{Vert}(G)$ and an involution $\sigma\colon \mathrm{Half}(G) \to \mathrm{Half}(G)$.*
- *The set of edges,* $\mathrm{Edge}(G)$*, is the set of two-cycles of σ and the legs,* $\mathrm{Leg}(G)$*, are the fixed points of σ.*
- *For a vertex v the valence is the cardinality of $f^{-1}(v)$, i.e. the number of half edges attached to v.*

Definition A.2. *A stable graph is a graph G such that every vertex v is decorated with a non-negative integer $g(v)$, called the genus of the vertex v, such that $2g(v) + n(v) \geq 3$. The genus of a stable graph (denoted $g(G)$) is given by* $\dim(\mathrm{H}_1(G)) + \sum_{v\in \mathrm{Vert}(G)} g(V)$.

Definition A.3. *Given a stable graph G its Euler Characteristic $\chi(G)$ is given by the difference* $\dim(\mathrm{H}_0(G)) - g(G)$.

Example A.4. For a connected stable graph G where every vertex has genus zero, one recovers the classical result for graphs $\chi(G) = |\operatorname{Vert}(G)| - |\operatorname{Edge}(G)|$.

A.2. **Feynman Expansions.** The ideas behind the arguments used in this section are largely standard and closely follow that of Etingof [16]. Indeed, the formulae of [16] can be extracted from our formulae by restricting to those stable graphs where every vertex has genus zero.

Throughout this section W is a symplectic vector space with a decomposition $W = \mathrm{H}(W) \oplus \mathcal{L}_s \oplus \operatorname{im}(d)$ given by an SDR, see 1.3. Recall the form $\sigma(?) = \langle ?, d? \rangle$ is non-degenerate on $\mathcal{L}_s$ and denote the inverse form on $\mathcal{L}_s^*$ by σ^{-1}. Integration over $\mathcal{L}_s$ is given by $id_{\mathrm{H}(W)} \otimes \int_{\mathcal{L}_s}$.

Definition A.5. *Let $f \in \mathfrak{h}[W]$. Given a connected stable graph G, the Feynman amplitude $F(G) \in (\mathrm{H}(W)^*)^{\otimes |\mathrm{Leg}(G)|}$ is given as follows:*

- *place at every vertex with genus i, j half edges, and k legs the component in the symmetric tensor $(\mathcal{L}_s^*)^{\otimes j} \otimes (\mathrm{H}(W)^*)^{\otimes k}$ of the coefficient of h^i in f.*
- *take contraction of tensors along each edge using the form σ^{-1}.*

If G is disconnected, then $F(G)$ is given by the product of the amplitudes given by its connected components. The empty stable graph has amplitude 1.

As is the case in all Feynman expansions, the key is Wick's Theorem.

Theorem A.6 (Wick's Theorem)**.** *Let $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_m \in \mathcal{L}_s^*$. If $m = 2k$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} \phi_1 \ldots \phi_m e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2}} = \sum_{\text{pairings}} \sigma^{-1}(\phi_{i_1}, \phi_{i_2}) \ldots \sigma^{-1}(\phi_{i_{k-1}}, \phi_{i_k}).$$

If m is odd, the integral is zero.

Proof. For the case m is odd the result is immediate. The case m is even is almost as straightforward, but requires to be broken down further: it is necessary to consider the cases of even integration and odd integration independently. For even integration it suffices to prove the result for $\phi_1 = \cdots = \phi_m = x$ for a canonical basis element x, i.e. one can assume $\mathcal{L}_s$ is one-dimensional. The result now readily follows from the definition of integration. For odd integration it, again, suffices to prove the result for a pairing of canonical odd coordinates ξ_i and ξ_j. Since odd elements square to zero $m = 2$ and the result is obvious. □

Theorem A.7. *Let $f \in \mathfrak{h}[W]$, then*

$$\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{f}{\hbar}} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} = \sum_G \hbar^{-\chi(G)} \frac{F(G)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(G)|},$$

where the sum is over all (possibly disconnected) stable graphs.

Proof. One can write the restriction of f to $\mathrm{H}(W)^* \oplus \mathcal{L}_s^*$ as $\sum_{i,j,k} \frac{1}{j!k!} \hbar^i f_{i,j,k}$, where j is the number of linear factors of $\mathcal{L}_s$ in $f_{i,j,k}$ and k is the number of linear factors of $\mathrm{H}(W)$. Making a substitution of $y\hbar^{\frac{1}{2}} = x$ in $\mathcal{L}_s$ and after expanding $e^{\frac{f}{\hbar}}$ in terms of its Taylor expansion, one can write

$$\int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{f}{\hbar}} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} = \sum_N Z_N,$$

where the sum is over $N = (n_{i,j,k})$, where each $n_{i,j,k}$ is an integer and is zero if $2i + j + k < 3$, and

$$Z_N = \int_{\mathcal{L}_s} \left(\prod_i \prod_j \prod_k \frac{\hbar^{\left(i+\frac{j}{2}-1\right)n_{i,j,k}}}{(j!k!)^{n_{i,j,k}} n_{i,j,k}!} f_{i,j,k}^{n_{i,j,k}} \right) e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}}.$$

Clearly, every $f_{i,j,k}$ is a product of linear functions and therefore, using Wick's Theorem (A.6), the integral for each N is given combinatorially as follows: every $f_{i,j,k}$ gives a decorated flower, i.e. a vertex with genus i, j half-edges, and k legs. One can then choose a pairing, p, of half-edges of all flowers and contract using σ^{-1} to produce a function F_p. Thus

$$Z_N = \prod_i \prod_j \prod_k \frac{\hbar^{\left(i+\frac{j}{2}-1\right)n_{i,j,k}}}{(j!k!)^{n_{i,j,k}} (n_{i,j,k}!)} \sum_p F_p.$$

A choice of pairing p of half-edges can be visualised as a glueing; thus a gluing creates a stable graph G and F_p is, in fact, precisely the Feynman amplitude $F(G)$. What's more, it is clear that any stable graph with $n_{i,j,k}$ vertices of genus i, valence j, and having k legs can be obtained from a pairing in this way. Since the goal is to sum over stable graphs, one must take care to deal with the redundancies arising from the fact that the same graph can be obtained in multiple ways from different pairings of half-edges. To this end, consider the permutations of half-edges that preserve decorated flowers. This group of permutations involves three parts: the permutations of flowers with a given genus, valence, and number of legs; permutations of the half-edges of a flower; and permutations of the legs of a flower. To be precise, the group is the semi-direct product

$$\prod_i \prod_j \prod_k S_{n_{i,j,k}} \ltimes (S_j^{n_{i,j,k}} \times S_k^{n_i,j,k}),$$

which has order $\prod_i \prod_j \prod_k (j!k!)^{n_{i,j,k}} (n_{i,j,k}!)$. It is clear to see that the group acts transitively on all pairings of half-edges that result in a particular stable graph and the stabiliser of such a pairing is the automorphism group of the resulting graph. Therefore, the number of pairings resulting in a stable graph G is given by $\frac{\prod_i \prod_j \prod_k (j!k!)^{n_{i,j,k}} (n_{i,j,k}!)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(G)|}$. Putting this all together, the result is obtained. □

Notice the series on the right hand side of Theorem A.7 involves arbitrary (possibly negative) powers of $\hbar$. This is to be expected since $e^{\frac{f}{\hbar}}$ has arbitrary powers of $\hbar$ and integration fixes the weight grading. These negative powers come from disjoint unions of graphs such as the one with two vertices, one edge, and four legs (two at each vertex). Taking the logarithm of the series in Theorem A.7 has the initially surprising effect of reducing the sum to over connected stable graphs, and thus multiplying by $\hbar$ results in only non-negative powers of $\hbar$.

Theorem A.8.

$$\hbar \log \int_{\mathcal{L}_s} e^{\frac{f}{\hbar}} e^{\frac{-\sigma}{2\hbar}} = \sum_{G \text{ connected}} \hbar^{-\chi(G)} \frac{F(G)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(G)|},$$

where the sum is over all connected stable graphs.

Proof. Writing any disconnected graph as $G = G_1^{k_1} \dots G_l^{k_l}$, for non-isomorphic connected graphs G_i, it is clear that $F(G) = F(G_1)^{k_1} \dots F(G_l)^{k_l}$ and $\chi(G) =$

$k_1\chi(G_1) + \cdots + k_l\chi(G_l)$. Further, $|\operatorname{Aut}(G)| = \prod_i \left(|\operatorname{Aut}(G_i))|^{k_i}(k_i!)\right)$. Thus, exponentiating the series

$$\frac{1}{\hbar}\sum_{G \text{ connected}} \hbar^{-\chi(G)}\frac{F(G)}{|\operatorname{Aut}(G)|},$$

one arrives at the series of Theorem A.7. □

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Andrey Lazarev for many useful suggestions, conversations, and for initially posing the project.

References

[1] Paul S. Aspinwall and Lukasz M. Fidkowski. Superpotentials for quiver gauge theories. *J. High Energy Phys.*, (10):047, 25, 2006.
[2] Paul S. Aspinwall and Sheldon Katz. Computation of superpotentials for D-branes. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 264(1):227–253, 2006.
[3] Denis Aleksandrovich Bashkirov. *The BV formalism for homotopy Lie algebras*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2014. Thesis (Ph.D.)–University of Minnesota.
[4] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky. Gauge algebra and quantization. *Phys. Lett. B*, 102(1):27–31, 1981.
[5] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky. Quantization of gauge theories with linearly dependent generators. *Phys. Rev. D (3)*, 28(10):2567–2582, 1983.
[6] C. Braun and A. Lazarev. Homotopy BV algebras in Poisson geometry. *Trans. Moscow Math. Soc.*, pages 217–227, 2013.
[7] C. Braun and A. Lazarev. Unimodular homotopy algebras and Chern-Simons theory. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 219(11):5158–5194, 2015.
[8] Christopher Braun. Operads and moduli spaces. *arXiv:1209.1088*, 2012.
[9] Alberto S. Cattaneo and Giovanni Felder. Poisson sigma models and deformation quantization. *Modern Phys. Lett. A*, 16(4-6):179–189, 2001. Euroconference on Brane New World and Noncommutative Geometry (Torino, 2000).
[10] Alberto S. Cattaneo and Pavel Mnëv. Remarks on Chern-Simons invariants. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 293(3):803–836, 2010.
[11] J. Chuang and A. Lazarev. Dual Feynman transform for modular operads. *Commun. Number Theory Phys.*, 1(4):605–649, 2007.
[12] J. Chuang and A. Lazarev. Feynman diagrams and minimal models for operadic algebras. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 81(2):317–337, 2010.
[13] Joseph Chuang and Andrey Lazarev. Abstract Hodge decomposition and minimal models for cyclic algebras. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 89(1):33–49, 2009.
[14] Joseph Chuang and Andrey Lazarev. L-infinity maps and twistings. *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, 13(2):175–195, 2011.
[15] Kevin Costello. *Renormalization and effective field theory*, volume 170 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.
[16] P. Etingof. Mathematical ideas and notions of quantum field theory. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology: MIT OpenCourseWare*, 2002.
[17] Pierre Gabriel. Des catégories abéliennes. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 90:323–448, 1962.
[18] Imma Gálvez-Carrillo, Andrew Tonks, and Bruno Vallette. Homotopy Batalin-Vilkovisky algebras. *J. Noncommut. Geom.*, 6(3):539–602, 2012.
[19] E. Getzler. Batalin-Vilkovisky algebras and two-dimensional topological field theories. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 159(2):265–285, 1994.
[20] E. Getzler and M. M. Kapranov. Modular operads. *Compositio Math.*, 110(1):65–126, 1998.
[21] Ezra Getzler. Lie theory for nilpotent L_∞-algebras. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 170(1):271–301, 2009.
[22] V. Ginzburg and M. Kapranov. Erratum to: "Koszul duality for operads" [Duke Math. J. **76** (1994), no. 1, 203–272; MR1301191 (96a:18004)]. *Duke Math. J.*, 80(1):293, 1995.
[23] J. Granåker. Unimodular L-infinity algebras. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2008.
[24] Alastair Hamilton and Andrey Lazarev. Cohomology theories for homotopy algebras and noncommutative geometry. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 9(3):1503–1583, 2009.

[25] Alastair Hamilton and Andrey Lazarev. Graph cohomology classes in the Batalin-Vilkovisky formalism. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 59(5):555–575, 2009.
[26] Vladimir Hinich. DG coalgebras as formal stacks. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 162(2-3):209–250, 2001.
[27] T. V. Kadeishvili. The algebraic structure in the homology of an $A(\infty)$-algebra. *Soobshch. Akad. Nauk Gruzin. SSR*, 108(2):249–252 (1983), 1982.
[28] Hiroshige Kajiura. Noncommutative homotopy algebras associated with open strings. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 19(1):1–99, 2007.
[29] Bernhard Keller and Dong Yang. Derived equivalences from mutations of quivers with potential. *Adv. Math.*, 226(3):2118–2168, 2011.
[30] Hovhannes M. Khudaverdian. Semidensities on odd symplectic supermanifolds. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 247(2):353–390, 2004.
[31] Maxim Kontsevich. Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 66(3):157–216, 2003.
[32] Maxim Kontsevich and Yan Soibelman. Deformations of algebras over operads and the Deligne conjecture. In *Conférence Moshé Flato 1999, Vol. I (Dijon)*, volume 21 of *Math. Phys. Stud.*, pages 255–307. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000.
[33] Y. Kosmann-Schwarzbach and J. Monterde. Divergence operators and odd Poisson brackets. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 52(2):419–456, 2002.
[34] Olga Kravchenko. Deformations of Batalin-Vilkovisky algebras. In *Poisson geometry (Warsaw, 1998)*, volume 51 of *Banach Center Publ.*, pages 131–139. Polish Acad. Sci., Warsaw, 2000.
[35] Dmitry Krotov and Andrei Losev. Quantum field theory as effective BV theory from Chern-Simons. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 806(3):529–566, 2009.
[36] Tom Lada and Martin Markl. Strongly homotopy Lie algebras. *Comm. Algebra*, 23(6):2147–2161, 1995.
[37] Andrey Lazarev. Maurer-Cartan moduli and models for function spaces. *Adv. Math.*, 235:296–320, 2013.
[38] Andrey Lazarev and Martin Markl. Disconnected rational homotopy theory. *Adv. Math.*, 283:303–361, 2015.
[39] Calin I. Lazaroiu. String field theory and brane superpotentials. *J. High Energy Phys.*, (10):Paper 18, 40, 2001.
[40] Jean-Louis Loday. *Cyclic homology*, volume 301 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992. Appendix E by María O. Ronco.
[41] Marco Manetti. Deformation theory via differential graded Lie algebras. In *Algebraic Geometry Seminars, 1998–1999 (Italian) (Pisa)*, pages 21–48. Scuola Norm. Sup., Pisa, 1999.
[42] Martin Markl. Loop homotopy algebras in closed string field theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 221(2):367–384, 2001.
[43] Martin Markl. Transferring A_∞ (strongly homotopy associative) structures. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2) Suppl.*, (79):139–151, 2006.
[44] J. Maunder. Koszul duality and homotopy theory of curved Lie algebras. *ArXiv e-prints*, December 2015.
[45] J. Maunder. Unbased rational homotopy theory: a Lie algebra approach. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2015.
[46] S. A. Merkulov. Strong homotopy algebras of a Kähler manifold. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (3):153–164, 1999.
[47] Jon P. Pridham. Unifying derived deformation theories. *Adv. Math.*, 224(3):772–826, 2010.
[48] Jian Qiu and Maxim Zabzine. Introduction to graded geometry, Batalin-Vilkovisky formalism and their applications. *Arch. Math. (Brno)*, 47(5):415–471, 2011.
[49] Daniel Quillen. Rational homotopy theory. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 90:205–295, 1969.
[50] Michael Schlessinger and James Stasheff. Deformation theory and rational homotopy type. *arXiv:1211.1647*, 2012.
[51] Albert Schwarz. Geometry of Batalin-Vilkovisky quantization. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 155(2):249–260, 1993.
[52] Pavol Ševera. On the origin of the BV operator on odd symplectic supermanifolds. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 78(1):55–59, 2006.

[53] Alessandro Tomasiello. A-infinity structure and superpotentials. *J. High Energy Phys.*, (9):Paper 30, 9, 2001.
[54] Michel Van den Bergh. Calabi-Yau algebras and superpotentials. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 21(2):555–603, 2015.
[55] Barton Zwiebach. Closed string field theory: quantum action and the Batalin-Vilkovisky master equation. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 390(1):33–152, 1993.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YF, United Kingdom
E-mail address: c.braun@lancaster.ac.uk

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YF, United Kingdom
E-mail address: j.maunder@lancaster.ac.uk